



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/762,106	02/02/2001	Dearg S Brown	PM-276502/Z-	8384

909 7590 05/06/2002
PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

MCKENZIE, THOMAS C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1624

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2002

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

09/762,106

Applicant(s)

BROWN ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas McKenzie Ph.D.

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,6,8-10 and 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,6,8-10 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to an application filed on 3/1/02. There are nine claims pending and nine under consideration. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 8 are compound claims. Claim 10 is a composition claim. Claim 12 is a use claim. Claim 9 is a synthesis claim. This is the first action on the merits. The application concerns some amidobenzamide compounds, compositions, and uses thereof.

Specification

2. This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required. The Examiner suggests lines 1-5 of claim 1 including the utility.

Title

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The following title is suggested: replacing the word "Amide" with the word "Amidobenzamide"

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the

subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "*in-vivo* cleavable ester" in claims 1, 6, 10, and 12 is indefinite. The issue on second paragraph is whether the structures of the claimed compounds are clearly defined. Applicants' "*in-vivo* cleavable ester" are molecules whose structure lie outside the subject matter of claim 1, but upon metabolism in the body are converted to active compounds falling within the structural scope of claim 1. The claim describes the function intended but provides no specific structural guidance to what constitutes an "*in-vivo* cleavable ester". Structural formulas, names, or both can accurately describe organic compounds, which are the subject matter of claim 1. Attempting to define means by function is not proper when the means can be clearly expressed in terms that are more precise.

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 2 recites the limitation "Q is furyl etc." in lines 15-19, page 99. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in claim 1 which requires Q to be phenyl.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 8 recites the limitation "6-quinolyl

...." in the eight and ninth entry. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in claim 1 which requires Q to be phenyl.

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claim provide for the use of the compounds of formula I, but the claims do not set forth any steps involved in determining what is "a disease or medical condition mediated by a cytokine". It is unclear what diseases and treatments applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how to practice this use. Identifying which diseases applicants intend this claim to cover will involve extensive and potentially inconclusive clinical research. With out such clinical research to identify the patients and diseases applicants intend to treat, one skilled in the art cannot determine the metes and bounds of the claim. Hence, the claims are indefinite.

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a

way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The phrase “*in-vivo* cleavable ester” in claims 1, 6, 10, and 12 lacks description. Nowhere in the specification are directions given for preparing any “*in-vivo* cleavable ester” of the claimed compounds. Since the structures of these “*in-vivo* cleavable ester”, compounds are uncertain, direction for their preparation must be even more unclear.

In addition, determining if a particular substance is a ““*in-vivo* cleavable ester” will involve undue experimentation. How much cleavage is required and how fast must it be? Must the cleavage occur only in humans or may it occur in any organism?

9. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treatment of rheumatoid arthritis and psoriasis, does not reasonably provide enablement for every “disease or medical condition mediated by a cytokine”. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. English (Trends) in figure 1, page 42 summarizes in which diseases other p38 enzyme inhibitors,

which is the postulated mechanism of action of Applicants compounds, clinical trials have started.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 9, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ashton, (J. Med. Chem.). The compound shown below fits formula I with Q = phenyl substituted by hydroxyl, p = o, q = 2, R³ = methyl, and R⁴ = cyclohexyl. The compound is shown in Scheme 7 on page 3346 of the reference and is compound 30. Biological testing results are shown in Table 5 on page 3349. Synthesis is disclosed in the first three paragraphs on the left side of page 3355. This synthesis anticipates Applicants' claim 9 for mode (b). Biological assay required mixing the compound with DMEM and albumin as taught in the final paragraph on page 3355. Thus, anticipating Applicants' composition claim 10. 1996. The reference teaches that the compounds are useful for treating hypercholesterolemia in the last complete paragraph on page 3343 of the reference.

For all the Examiner knows, hypercholesterolemia is "a disease or medical condition mediated by a cytokine". Thus, Applicants use claim 12 is anticipated.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art does not teach or make obvious compounds with $R^4 = \text{phenyl}$.

Conclusion

12. Please direct any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner to Thomas C McKenzie, Ph. D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-9806. The FAX number for before final amendments is (703) 872-9306. The Examiner is available from 8:30 to 5:30, Monday through Friday. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, you can reach the Examiner's supervisor, Mukund Shah at (703) 308-4716. Please direct general inquiries or any inquiry relating to the status of this application to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Mukund Shah

**Mukund Shah
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1624**

TCMcK
May 3, 2002

